

Application No.: 09/916,746

Docket No.: FRASER 3.0-002

IN THE DRAWINGS

Replace the drawings of record with the attached replacement drawing sheets FIGS. 1-3.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

The present communication is responsive to the Official Action mailed February 14, 2005. A petition for a one-month extension of the term for responding to the Official Action, to and including June 14, 2005, is filed concurrently herewith.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings for not including "textual labels when possible, such as in Fig. 1, element 103-105." (Official Action at 2.) Applicant is filing concurrently herewith a new set of formal drawings, which includes replacement drawing sheets FIGS. 1-3. Applicant respectfully submits that the replacement drawing sheets are in full compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 121(d) and request that the drawings of record be replaced with the replacement sheets. Applicant also respectfully submits that no new matter is included in the new set of replacement drawing sheets.

The Examiner objected to the title of the application and recommended a new title therefor. As indicated above, applicant has substituted the title of record with the one suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner also objected to the specification because of the misspelling of the word "Collision" in paragraph [0002]. Applicant has corrected this error. Applicant has also corrected another error in paragraph [0002] as indicated above. Applicant respectfully requests that paragraph [0002] be replaced by the replacement paragraph therefor.

Claims 3, 18, 20 and 24-26 have been canceled as a result of the present amendment. Claims 28 through 33 are presented for the first time.

Claim 1 has been amended to be directed to "An apparatus." Claim 1 has also been recast to include the

features previously recited in claim 3. In particular, claim 1 recites "a memory for storing a network device name, the network device name being displayed on an exterior surface of the apparatus; and an interface that may be connected to a network device, and wherein when the interface is connected to the network device, the network device name is loaded into the network device and utilized by the network device in communications across a network." Support for the amendments to claim 1 may also be found by reference to, for example, paragraphs [0016] through [0018] of the specification. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that the amendments to claim 1 do not constitute the addition of new matter.

Claims 2 and 4-13 have been amended to improve their form 1 and recites proper antecedents to claim 1.

Claim 14 has been recast to include the subject matter previously recited in claim 18. In particular, claim 14 has been amended to recite "affixing an electronically addressable tag storing a network device name to the network device, the network device name being visibly apparent on a surface of the electronically addressable tag; [and] establishing an electronic connection between the network device and the electronically addressable tag." Support for the amendments to claim 14 may also be found by reference to, for example, paragraph [0016] and [0017] of the specification. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added to the application as a result of the amendments to claim 14.

In view of the amendments to claim 14, claims 15, 16, 17, 19 and 21 have been amended to improve their form.

Claim 22 has been recast to include the subject matter previously recited in claims 24 and 25. In particular, claim 22 has been amended to recite "storing the network device name in a tag as a digital representation of a pictorial icon that is displayed on the tag's exterior, the tag being adapted to be

physically connected to a first network device such that the network device name may be loaded into the first network device and utilized to configure the first network device." Support for the amendments to claim 22 may also be found by reference to, for example, paragraphs [0017] and [0018] of the specification. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that the amendments to claim 22 do not constitute the addition of new matter.

Claims 23 and 27 have been amended to improve their form in view of the amendments to claims 22 and 14.

Newly presented claim 28 depends from claim 1 and recites "wherein when the apparatus is physically moved and connected to another network device the network device name is loaded into the another network device and utilized by the another network device in communications across the network." Support for claim 28 may be found by reference to, for example, paragraph [0007] of the specification. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claim 28 does not constitute the addition of new matter.

Newly presented claims 29-33 recite additional features of the claimed invention. Support for these claims may be found by reference to, for example, paragraphs [0021] to [0024] of the specification.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 through 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, "as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention." (*Id.* at 3.) In particular, the Examiner noted the confusion caused by use of the word "device" in the preamble and "network device" in the body of the claim. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, meets all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. In addition, applicant respectfully submits that claims 2

and 4-13, as amended, also meet all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6-17, and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,884,322 to Sidhu et al. ("Sidhu"). (Official Action at 4.) The Examiner also rejected claims 3-5, 18-20, and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sidhu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,643 to Ohara et al. ("Ohara"). (Id. at 6.)

In rejecting claims 3-5, 18-20, and 24-26 over Sidhu in view of Ohara, the Examiner concedes that "Sidhu does not disclose expressly the name of the device being displayed outside of the device or digital pictorial icon representing the device displayed outside the device." (Id.) The Examiner asserts, however, that Ohara makes up for the deficiency in Sidhu by disclosing "a network device where its device is displayed external to the device itself on the CRT, where the device name and a digital pictorial icon is displayed (Column 17, lines 5-15)." (Id.)

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections are moot in view of the present amendment.

In particular, even though Ohara teaches display of a device name and icon on a CRT, Ohara does not disclose or suggest an apparatus as is now recited in claim 1. Specifically, Ohara does not disclose or suggest "the network device name being displayed on an exterior surface of the apparatus, . . . and wherein when the interface is connected to the network device, the network device name is loaded into the network device and utilized by the network device in communications across the network."

Further in that regard, Ohara does not teach or suggest "affixing an electronically addressable tag storing a network device name to the network device, the network device

name being visibly apparent on a surface of the electronically addressable tag; . . . loading the network device name stored in the electronically addressable tag into the network device; and configuring the network device to utilize the network device name in communications across a network," as is now recited in claim 14.

With regard to claim 22, *Ohara* does not teach or suggest "storing the network device name in a tag as a digital representation of the pictorial icon that is displayed on the tag's exterior."

Inasmuch as the Examiner admits *Sidhu* does not disclose or suggest "the name of the device being displayed outside of the device or a digital pictorial icon representing the device displayed outside the device," *Sidhu* certainly does not make up for the deficiencies in *Ohara*.

In addition, applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner assertion in item 13 that "*Sidhu* discloses . . . wherein the network device name comprises a digital representation of an alphanumeric name." The Examiner cites to col. 10, ln. 5 of *Sidhu* to support this assertion. But that portion of *Sidhu* describes only how the use of a given identity can be electronically transferred between two machines. Applicant respectfully submits that *Sidhu* does not support the Examiner's assertion in this regard.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claims 1, 14, and 22 are not rendered obvious for at least the foregoing reasons. As all the other claims remaining in the application depend from either claim 1, 14 or 22, applicant also respectfully submits that the remaining claims are also not rendered obvious by the combination of *Sidhu* and *Ohara* for at least the foregoing reasons. In addition, as the other references cited by the Examiner do not make up for the deficiencies in *Sidhu* and *Ohara*, applicant respectfully submits

that these references cannot be combined in any manner to render the claims pending in the application obvious.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: June 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Orville R. Cockings

Registration No.: 42,424

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant